arXiv:1602.05448v3 [quant-ph] 29 Aug 2016

Optimal measurements for nonlocal correlations

Sacha Schwarz*, André Stefanov*, Stefan Wolf†, Alberto Montina†
* *Institute of Applied Physics, University of Bern, 3012 Bern, Switzerland and*
† *Facoltà di Informatica, Università della Svizzera italiana, 6900 Lugano, Switzerland*

(Dated: August 30, 2016)

A problem in quantum information theory is to find the experimental setup that maximizes the nonlocality of correlations with respect to some suitable measure such as the violation of Bell inequalities. There are however some complications with Bell inequalities. First and foremost it is unfeasible to determine the whole set of Bell inequalities already for a few measurements and thus unfeasible to find the experimental setup maximizing their violation. Second, the Bell violation suffers from an ambiguity stemming from the choice of the normalization of the Bell coefficients. An alternative measure of nonlocality with a direct information-theoretic interpretation is the minimal amount of classical communication required for simulating nonlocal correlations. In the case of many instances simulated in parallel, the minimal communication cost per instance is called nonlocal capacity, and its computation can be reduced to a convex-optimization problem. This quantity can be computed for a higher number of measurements and turns out to be useful for finding the optimal experimental setup. Focusing on the bipartite case, we present a simple method for maximizing the nonlocal capacity over a given configuration space and, in particular, over a set of possible measurements, yielding the corresponding optimal setup. Furthermore, we show that there is a functional relationship between Bell violation and nonlocal capacity. The method is illustrated with numerical tests and compared with the maximization of the violation of CGLMP-type Bell inequalities on the basis of entangled two-qubit as well as two-qutrit states. Remarkably, the anomaly of nonlocality displayed by qutrits turns out to be even stronger if the nonlocal capacity is employed as a measure of nonlocality.

I. INTRODUCTION

A peculiarity of quantum theory is the principle of complementarity, stating that there are complementary measurements which cannot be performed simultaneously. Although the knowledge of the results of every possible observation is intrinsically out of reach of experiments, complementarity is not *per se* inconsistent with the classical realist view that results are intrinsic properties independent of the actual realization of a measurement. That is, ascribing results to every possible measurement does not lead to logical inconsistency. However, in a seminal paper [1], John Bell gave a characterization of *local realism*, implying that certain quantum correlations cannot be explained by shared classical information under the assumption that the measurement settings are freely chosen. Indeed, in classical terms, such correlations can be explained by message transmission only. On the other hand, such an influence, if it did in fact exist, would not only need to be of infinite speed (in a preferred frame) [2, 3], but it also requires fine-tuning [4].

Besides their foundational importance, these *nonlocal correlations* have gained increasing interest as an information-processing resource. For example, they have a fundamental role in device-independent applications, such as key agreement in cryptography [5–11] and randomness amplification [12, 13]. Furthermore, they can exponentially reduce the amount of communication required to solve some distributed computational problems [14, 15]. For some tasks, the use of nonlocal correlations can make communication unnecessary, such as in pseudo-telepathy games [16]. Some stronger-than-quantum nonsignaling correlations can even collapse the communication complexity in any two-party scenario. Indeed, the access to an unlimited number of Popescu-Rohrlich (PR) nonlocal boxes allows two parties to solve any communication complexity problem with the aid of a constant amount of classical communication [17].

In view of the information-processing applications of nonlocality, a practical problem is to find the optimal configuration of an experimental apparatus maximizing the strength of nonlocality. For example, one can better exploit a given quantum state by using an optimal set of measurements. For this purpose, it is necessary to maximize some suitable measure of nonlocality. The set of local correlations can be characterized by a polytope whose facets are defined by Bell inequalities [18]. Thus, the maximal violation over the whole set of inequalities can be used as a possible measure. However, this quantity does not have a clear information-theoretic meaning and suffers from an ambiguity related to the way the Bell coefficients are normalized. Furthermore, the computation of all the facets has generally a time cost growing more than exponentially in the number of measurements. Indeed, a brute-force computation of every facet has a cost growing exponentially in the number of vertices and the number of vertices grows exponentially in the number of measurements. Although there are better algorithms for efficiently computing the facets under some condition [19], it is unknown whether the time complexity is actually polynomial. It is a fact that the whole set of Bell inequalities has been computed only for a small number of measurements, parties, and outcomes [20, 21]. In particular, to determine the optimal experimental configuration maximizing the violation over the whole set of inequalities is unfeasible even for few measurements.

An alternative measure with a more direct information-related interpretation has been employed in Refs. [16, 22–27] and relies on the very definition of nonlocality; nonlocal correlations require some communication to be classically simulated, thus the minimal amount of required classical communication can be used as a measure of the strength of nonlocality. We call this measure *communication complexity* of the nonlocal resource. As shown by Pironio [28], the maximal violation of the Bell inequalities and the communication complexity of nonlocal resources turn out to be identical if the average amount of communication is employed as a measure of the communication cost. However, the coefficients of each inequality have to be rescaled by a factor whose computation requires solving a set of communication complexity problems. The recent work in Ref. [26] mainly focused on the minimal asymptotic communication cost of parallel simulations in the asymptotic limit of infinite instances. This quantity, called *nonlocal capacity*, is a lower bound on the minimal average communication cost and differs from it by a term scaling not more than the logarithm of the nonlocal capacity. Thus, for high communication complexity, the two quantities are essentially equivalent. The *nonlocal capacity* is easier to be computed than its single-shot counterpart, considered in Ref. [28].

Importantly, the nonlocal capacity turns out to have a functional relationship with the Bell violation. Namely, for every Bell inequality, the nonlocal capacity is bounded from below by a function of the violation. Furthermore, there is a Bell inequality such that the bound is tight and equal to the nonlocal capacity. This functional relationship extends the result of Ref. [28] to the case of the nonlocal capacity.

Focusing on the bipartite case, our main goal is to introduce a method for maximizing the nonlocal capacity over the space of experimental configurations. For this purpose, we first need to introduce a simple algorithm for computing the nonlocal capacity. In Ref. [26], we showed that such a computation can be reduced to a convex optimization problem, but we did not provide an explicit numerical method. The algorithm here introduced is a modification of the one recently derived in Ref. [29] for computing the asymptotic communication complexity of quantum communication processes. As shown in Ref. [29], the algorithm displays notable convergence properties with respect to available optimization packages. Numerical tests with up to 27 measurements were performed with a maximal computational time of the order of one hour and 6 digits of precision on a laptop with a *2.3GHz Intel Core i7* processor. Similar convergence properties are displayed by the algorithm introduced here for computing the nonlocal capacity. This is in notable contrast to the computation of all the facets of the local polytope, which becomes unfeasible for a much smaller size of the problem input. The method applies to every bipartite quantum state and, more generally, to every nonsignaling correlation.

We then present a simple method for maximizing the nonlocal capacity over a given configuration space and, in particular, over a set of possible measurements with a given quantum state. The method yields the optimal experimental setup. Furthermore, we discuss the relation between nonlocal capacity and violation of the Bell inequalities. This relation is investigated in numerical tests of the introduced numerical method by considering CGLMP-type Bell inequalities on the basis of entangled two-qubit as well as two-qutrit states. Remarkably, the anomaly of nonlocality displayed by entangled qutrits is even stronger if the nonlocal capacity is employed as a measure of nonlocality. Namely, the maximal nonlocal capacity is exhibited for a quantum state with less entanglement with respect to the quantum state providing maximal violation.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the *nonlocal capacity* of nonsignaling correlations and the main result of Ref. [26], where the computation of the nonlocal capacity was reduced to a convex-optimization problem. In Sec. III, we present the algorithm for computing the nonlocal capacity. In Sec. IV, the dual form of the optimization problem introduced in Ref. [26] is derived. This form is then used in Sec. V to derive the method for maximizing the nonlocal capacity over a given configuration space. In particular, we study the optimization over the space of projective measurements. In Sec. VI, we discuss the relation between the nonlocal capacity and Bell inequality violation. Finally, in Sec. VII, we present the numerical tests.

II. MEASURE OF NONLOCAL CORRELATIONS

Here, we introduce the nonlocal capacity as a measure of nonlocality. First, we introduce the concept of a nonsignaling box as an abstract object producing correlated outcomes. Then, we define the nonlocal capacity as the minimal asymptotic communication cost required for a classical simulation of the box. Finally, we revise the results of Ref. [26], where we showed that the computation of the nonlocal capacity can be reduced to a convex-optimization problem.

A. Nonsignaling boxes

In a Bell scenario, two quantum systems are prepared in an entangled state and delivered to two spatially separate parties, say Alice and Bob. Then, the parties each perform a measurement on their own system and get an outcome. In general, Alice and Bob are allowed to choose among their respective sets of possible measurements. We assume that the sets are finite, but arbitrarily large. Let us denote the measurements performed by Alice and Bob by the indices $a \in \{1, \ldots, A\}$ and $b \in \{1, \ldots, B\}$, respectively. After the measurements, Alice gets an out-

come $r \in \mathcal{R}$ and Bob an outcome $s \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are two sets with cardinality R and S, respectively. The overall scenario is described by the joint conditional probability $P(r,s|a,b)$. Since the parties are spatially separate, causality and relativity imply that this distribution satisfies the nonsignaling conditions

$$\begin{aligned} P(r|a,b) &= P(r|a,\bar{b}) \;\; \forall a,r,b,\bar{b}, \\ P(s|a,b) &= P(s|\bar{a},b) \;\; \forall b,s,a,\bar{a}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $P(r|a,b) \equiv \sum_s P(r,s|a,b)$ and $P(s|a,b) \equiv \sum_r P(r,s|a,b)$ are the marginal conditional probabilities of r and s, respectively. In the following discussion, we consider a more general scenario including non-quantum correlations, and we just assume that $P(r,s|a,b)$ satisfies the nonsignaling conditions. The abstract machine producing the correlated variables r and s from the inputs a and b will be called *nonsignaling box* (briefly, NS-box).

B. Nonlocal capacity

As mentioned in the introduction, nonlocal correlations can be explained classically with communication between the parties. Generally, every NS-box can be simulated through local randomness and communication. The minimal amount of required communication is called *communication complexity* of the NS-box. Let us denote this quantity by $\mathcal{C}_{min}$. NS-boxes that cannot be simulated only through mere local randomness are called *nonlocal boxes* (NL-boxes), and their communication complexity is strictly positive. Conversely, vanishing communication complexity is a signature of local correlations. If N NS-boxes are simulated in parallel, the minimal communication cost per instance in the limit $N \to \infty$ is called *asymptotic communication complexity*, or *nonlocal capacity* [26]. Let us denote it by $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$. Since parallel protocols are more general than single-shot protocols, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \leq \mathcal{C}_{min}.$$

Different definitions of communication cost can be employed, such as worst-case communication [16], average communication [22, 23] and the entropy-based definition used in Ref. [26]. The last two are equivalent in the asymptotic case and give the same nonlocal capacity. Hereafter, we employ the average communication for the single-shot case in order to compare our results with some results from Ref. [28]. We will consider only one-way communication from one party to the other.

C. Computation of nonlocal capacity

In Ref. [26], we showed that the computation of the nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ is equivalent to a convex-optimization problem. Tight lower and upper bounds on the single-shot communication complexity $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ are given in terms of $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$. The optimization is made over a suitable set of probability distributions. The set, denoted by $\mathcal{V}(P)$, depends on the NS-box P and is defined as follows.

Definition 1. *Given a NS-box $P(r,s|a,b)$, the set $\mathcal{V}(P)$ is defined as the set of conditional probabilities $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ over r and the sequence $\mathbf{s} = \{s_1,\ldots,s_B\} \in \mathcal{S}^B$ whose marginal distribution of r and the b-th element of $\mathbf{s}$ is equal to $P(r,s|a,b)$. In other words, the set $\mathcal{V}(P)$ contains every $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ satisfying the constraints*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{s},s_b=s} \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) = P(r,s|a,b) \quad \forall a,b,r \text{ and } s, \tag{2}$$

where the sum is performed over every element of the sequence $\mathbf{s}$ except the b-th element s_b, which is set equal to s.

The central result in Ref. [26] is a convex-optimization problem that yields the nonlocal capacity of the NS-box P. The nonlocal capacity is equal to the minimum of the capacity of the channels $\rho(\mathbf{s}|a) \equiv \sum_r \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ such that $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) \in \mathcal{V}(P)$. Let us recall that a channel $x \to y$ is a stochastic process defined by a conditional probability $\rho(y|x)$ of getting the value y given x. Its capacity, which we denote by $C(x \to y)$, is the maximum of the mutual information between x and y over the space of probability distributions $\rho(x)$ of the input x [30], that is,

$$C(x \to y) \equiv \max_{\rho(x)} I(X;Y), \tag{3}$$

the mutual information $I(X,Y)$ being defined as [30]

$$I(X;Y) = \sum_x \sum_y \rho(x,y) \log_2 \frac{\rho(x,y)}{\rho(x)\rho(y)}, \tag{4}$$

where $\rho(x,y)$ is the joint probability distribution of x and y, and $\rho(x)$ and $\rho(y)$ are the marginal distributions of x and y, respectively.

Given these definitions, let us introduce the functional $\mathcal{D}(P)$ as the minimum of the capacity $C(a \to \mathbf{s})$ over the distributions $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) \in \mathcal{V}(P)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(P) \equiv \min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{V}(P)} C(a \to \mathbf{s}) = \\ \min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{V}(P)} \max_{\rho(a)} I(A;\mathbf{S}). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The following theorems, proven in Ref. [26], relate $\mathcal{D}(P)$ to the communication complexity and the nonlocal capacity.

Theorem 1. *The nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ of P is equal to $\mathcal{D}(P)$.*

Theorem 2. *The communication complexity $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ is bounded by the inequalities*

$$\mathcal{D}(P) \leq \mathcal{C}_{min} \leq \mathcal{D}(P) + 2\log_2[\mathcal{D}(P)+1] + 2\log_2 e. \tag{6}$$

These inequalities hold even if the entropy-based definition of communication is employed. The single-shot communication complexity $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ is always greater than or equal to the nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$. However, the difference scales at most logarithmically in $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$. Let us stress that the communication is from Alice to Bob and the nonlocal capacity from Bob to Alice can take a different value. Theorem 1 reduces the computation of the nonlocal capacity to the following convex-optimization problem.

Problem 1.

$$\begin{array}{c} \min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)} C(a\to\mathbf{s}) \\ \text{subject to the constraints} \\ \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\geq 0, \\ \sum_{\mathbf{s},s_b=s}\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)=P(r,s|a,b). \end{array} \tag{7}$$

Note that the capacity $C(a\to\mathbf{s})$ is convex in $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ since the mutual information is convex in $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ [30] and the pointwise maximum of a set of convex functions is a convex function [31].

In general, the channel capacity does not have a known analytic expression. Thus, the computation of $\mathcal{D}(P)$ turns out to be a minimax problem over the variables $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ and $\rho(a)$. However, in some symmetric problems, it is possible to get rid of the maximization over $\rho(a)$ in Eq. (5). This can be shown by using Sion's minimax theorem [32] and some general properties of the mutual information. As the mutual information is convex in $\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)$ and concave in $\rho(a)$ [30], we have from the minimax theorem that the minimization and maximization in Eq. (5) can be interchanged. Thus, we obtain

$$\mathcal{D}(P)=\max_{\rho(a)}\mathcal{J}(P) \tag{8}$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}(P)\equiv\min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{V}(P)} I(A;\mathbf{S}) \tag{9}$$

is a functional of $\rho(a)$. As $I(A;\mathbf{S})$ is concave in $\rho(a)$ and the pointwise minimum of a set of concave functions is concave [31], the functional $\mathcal{J}(P)$ is concave. In some symmetric cases, it is easy to find the distribution $\rho_{max}(a)$ maximizing $\mathcal{J}(P)$. For example, if the conditional probability $P(r,s|a,b)$ is invariant under the transformation $a\to a+1$ up to some suitable transformation of b, r and s, then we can infer by symmetry and the concavity of $\mathcal{J}(P)$ that the uniform distribution maximizes $\mathcal{J}(P)$.

Thus, if $\rho_{max}(a)$ is known, the computation of $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ is reduced to the following convex-optimization problem.

Problem 2.

$$\begin{array}{c} \min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)} I(A;\mathbf{S}) \\ \text{subject to the constraints} \\ \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\geq 0, \\ \sum_{\mathbf{s},s_b=s}\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)=P(r,s|a,b). \end{array} \tag{10}$$

As shown later, the dual form of Problem 2 is a geometric program (see Ref. [31] for an introduction to dual theory). Geometric programs are an extensively studied class of nonlinear optimization problems [33, 34] and the commercial package MOSEK (see http://www.mosek.com) provides a solver specialized for this class. However, if the distribution $\rho_{max}(a)$ is not known and we set $\rho(a)$ equal to an arbitrary distribution, the solution of Problem 2 yields merely a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity.

In Sec. III, we present a simple and robust algorithm that *directly* solves Problem 1.

III. NUMERICAL COMPUTATION OF THE NONLOCAL CAPACITY

The computation of the nonlocal capacity is performed through block minimization [35]. First, let us show that the mutual information $I(\mathbf{S};A)$ can be written as the minimum of

$$\mathcal{K}=\sum_{r,\mathbf{s},a}\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a)\log\frac{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)}{R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)} \tag{11}$$

with respect to the probability distribution $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ under the constraints

$$\begin{array}{c} \sum_r R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)-\sum_r R(r,\mathbf{s}|\bar{a})=0\ \ \forall a,\bar{a},\ \text{and}\ \mathbf{s}, \\ \sum_{r,\mathbf{s}} R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)=1. \end{array} \tag{12}$$

The first equality establishes a nonsignaling condition on $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$. The minimum is given by setting the derivative with respect to $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ of the Lagrangian

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{L}=\mathcal{K}+\sum_a\beta(a)\left[\sum_{r,\mathbf{s}}R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)-1\right]+ \\ \sum_{r,\mathbf{s},a,\bar{a}}\alpha(\mathbf{s},a,\bar{a})\left[R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)-R(r,\mathbf{s}|\bar{a})\right] \end{array} \tag{13}$$

equal to zero, $\alpha(\mathbf{s},a,\bar{a})$ and $\beta(a)$ being Lagrange multipliers, which are set so that the constraints (12) are satisfied. We obtain that the minimizer takes the form

$$R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)=\frac{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a)}{\beta(a)+\sum_{\bar{a}}\left[\alpha(\mathbf{s},a,\bar{a})-\alpha(\mathbf{s},\bar{a},a)\right]}. \tag{14}$$

The constraints are satisfied if $\alpha(\mathbf{s},a,\bar{a})=\frac{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a)\rho(\bar{a})}{\rho(\mathbf{s})}$ and $\beta(a)=\rho(a)$, where $\rho(\mathbf{s})\equiv\sum_a\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a)$. Indeed, this gives

$$R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)=\frac{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(\mathbf{s})}{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)}, \tag{15}$$

which trivially satisfies the constraints. Therefore, the minimum of $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ is the mutual information $I(\mathbf{S};A)$. Thus, Eq. (5) turns into the following minimax problem,

$$\mathcal{D}(P)=\min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{V}(P)}\max_{\rho(a)}\min_{R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{W}}\mathcal{K}, \tag{16}$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of nonsignaling distributions $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ satisfying the constraints (12). As $\mathcal{K}$ is linear in $\rho(a)$ and convex in $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$, we can swap the second minimization and the maximization [32], and obtain

$$\mathcal{D}(P) = \min_{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{V}(P)} \min_{R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\in\mathcal{W}} \bar{\mathcal{K}}, \tag{17}$$

where

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}} \equiv \max_{\rho(a)} \mathcal{K} \tag{18}$$

is a convex functional of $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ and $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$. As done in Ref. [29] for the computation of the communication complexity of quantum communication processes, a simple way to compute the nonlocal capacity is to minimize alternately $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ with respect to $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ and $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$. This takes to the following algorithm (see Ref. [29] for details).

Algorithm 1. (solving Problem 1).

1. Set some initial distribution $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) > 0$.
2. Maximize the mutual information
$$I(\mathbf{S};A) = \sum_{\mathbf{s},a} \rho(\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a) \log \frac{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)}{\sum_{\bar{a}} \rho(\mathbf{s}|\bar{a})\rho(\bar{a})} \tag{19}$$
with respect to $\rho(a)$ [computation of the capacity of the channel $\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)$].
3. Set $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a) = \frac{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(\mathbf{s})}{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)}$ [minimization of $\mathcal{K}$ w.r.t. $R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$, see Eq. (15)].
4. Compute $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ solving the equations
$$\sum_{\mathbf{s},s_b=s} R(r,\mathbf{s}|a) e^{\sum_{\bar{b}} \lambda(r,s_{\bar{b}},a,\bar{b})} = P(r,s|a,b). \tag{20}$$
5. Set $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) = R(r,\mathbf{s}|a) e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)}$ [minimization of $\mathcal{K}$ w.r.t. $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) \in \mathcal{V}(P)$].
6. Stop if a given accuracy is reached (see later discussion).
7. Repeat from step 2.

The computation at step 4 is equivalent to maximizing the functional

$$\begin{array}{c} \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) - \\ \sum_{r,\mathbf{s},a} R(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a) e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)} \end{array} \tag{21}$$

with respect to λ [29], which is a convex unconstrained optimization and can be easily done by using the Newton method. The algorithm does not provide only the solution of Problem 1, but the computed variables $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ also converge to the solution of the dual form, introduced in the following section. If $\rho(a)$ maximizing $\mathcal{J}(P)$ is known, step 2 can be skipped and the algorithm solves Problem 2.

The iterations stop at step 6 when a given accuracy is reached. As done in Ref. [29], the accuracy is estimated by computing the difference between the $\mathcal{K}$ and a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity derived from $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ and $\rho(a)$. In Sec. VI B we will provide a formula for computing this lower bound.

IV. DUAL PROBLEM

Here, we derive the dual form of Problem 2 (See Ref. [31] for an introduction to dual theory). The dual form of a minimization problem (primal problem) is a maximization problem whose maximum is always smaller than or equal to the primal minimum, the difference being called *duality gap*. However, if the constraints of the primal problem satisfy some mild conditions such as Slater's conditions [31], then the duality gap is equal to zero. This is the case of Problem 2. Thus, the primal and dual problems turn out to be equivalent. As for the case of quantum communication processes [36, 37], the dual form has some appealing properties that make it efficient to compute lower bounds for every $P(r,s|a,b)$ given a feasible point of the dual constraints. These properties will be employed for the computation of the optimal set of measurements maximizing the nonlocal correlations for a given quantum state. Furthermore, the relationship between Bell violation and nonlocal capacity comes directly from these properties, as shown in Sec. VI.

The dual objective function is obtained by minimizing the Lagrangian with respect to the primal variables over the domain of the primal objective function. The dual variables are the Lagrange multipliers associated with the primal constraints. Let us take the set of nonnegative distributions $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ as domain. The Lagrangian of Problem 2 is

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{L} = I(\mathbf{S};A) - \\ \sum_{r,s,a,b} \lambda(r,s,a,b) \left[\sum_{\mathbf{s},s_b=s} \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) - P(r,s|a,b)\right] \rho(a), \end{array} \tag{22}$$

which can be written in the form

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{L} = \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) + \\ \sum_{r,\mathbf{s},a} \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a)\big[\log \frac{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)}{\rho(\mathbf{s})} - \sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)\big]. \end{array} \tag{23}$$

Only the second term depends on $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$, and is equal to zero for $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) = 0$. Let us show that it is nonnegative for every distribution $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$, provided that

$$\sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)} \leq 1. \tag{24}$$

The second term can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{L}_2 \equiv -\sum_{r,\mathbf{s},a} \rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(a) \log \left[\frac{\rho(\mathbf{s})}{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)} e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)}\right]. \tag{25}$$

Using Jensen's inequality and the concavity of the logarithm, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_2 \geq -\mathcal{N} \log \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{r,\mathbf{s},a} \frac{\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)\rho(\mathbf{s})}{\rho(\mathbf{s}|a)} \rho(a) e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)}, \tag{26}$$

where $\mathcal{N} \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{s}} \rho(\mathbf{s})$. This equation implies

$$\mathcal{L}_2 \geq -\mathcal{N} \log \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \sum_{\mathbf{s},a} \rho(\mathbf{s})\rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)} \geq 0, \tag{27}$$

the second inequality being a consequence of Ineq. (24). Hence, the minimum of $\mathcal{L}_2$ is equal to zero under the constraints (24). Let us now show that the minimum of $\mathcal{L}_2$ is $-\infty$ if Ineq. (24) is not satisfied for some $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}'$. Let us take the distribution

$$\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a) = \alpha \delta_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}'} \frac{\delta_{r,\bar{r}(a)} e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)}}{\sum_{a'} \rho(a') \max_{r'} e^{\sum_b \lambda(r',s_b,a',b)}} \tag{28}$$

where α is a positive real number and $\bar{r}(a)$ the maximizer of $e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s'_b,a,b)}$ with respect to r. Note that $\rho(r,\mathbf{s}|a)$ is not generally normalized. Thus, the function $\mathcal{L}_2$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = -\alpha \log \sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s'_b,a,b)} \leq 0 \tag{29}$$

and goes to $-\infty$ for $\alpha \to +\infty$. Hence, the dual problem is the maximization of

$$\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) + I_2(\lambda) \tag{30}$$

with respect to $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$, where $I_2(\lambda)$ is equal to zero if constraints (24) are satisfied and equal to $-\infty$ otherwise. Thus, the optimization is equivalent to maximizing the objective function

$$I_{dual} = \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) \tag{31}$$

under constraints (24). Note that the constraints can also be written in the form

$$\sum_a \rho(a) e^{\sum_b \lambda(r_a,s_b,a,b)} \leq 1 \quad \forall \mathbf{r} \text{ and } \mathbf{s}, \tag{32}$$

where $\mathbf{r} \equiv (r_1, \ldots, r_A) \in \mathcal{R}^A$ is a sequence of elements in the set $\mathcal{R}$. In this form, the optimization problem is a geometric program [33, 34].

In conclusion, the dual form of Problem 2 is

Problem 3.

$$\begin{gathered} \max_\lambda \textstyle\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) \\ \text{subject to the constraints} \\ \textstyle\sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)} \leq 1. \end{gathered} \tag{33}$$

Performing also the maximization with respect to $\rho(a)$, we obtain the optimization problem

Problem 4.

$$\begin{gathered} \max_{\rho(a)} \max_\lambda \textstyle\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) \\ \text{subject to the constraints} \\ \textstyle\sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)} \leq 1, \end{gathered} \tag{34}$$

which is equivalent to Problem 1. The algorithm introduced in Sec. III does not solve only the primal problem 1, but computes also the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ and the distribution $\rho(a)$ solving Problem 4. The Lagrange multipliers are asymptotically approached by the variables computed at step 4 of the algorithm, whereas the distribution $\rho(a)$ is approached by the variables computed at step 2.

The dual Problem 3 has some interesting properties. First, the objective function is linear in the input distribution $P(r,s|a,b)$ and its computational time scales linearly in the size of the problem input, that is, as $RSAB$. Second, the constraints do not depend on the problem input $P(r,s|a,b)$. This implies that a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity can be evaluated efficiently for every $P(r,s|a,b)$ once a feasible point of the constraints is known. These properties will be exploited by the algorithm introduced in the next section. Furthermore, these properties will be used in Sec. VI to derive the functional relationship between nonlocal capacity and Bell violation.

V. OPTIMIZING THE SET OF MEASUREMENTS

A. General discussion

Suppose that the conditional probability $P(r,s|a,b) \equiv P_x(r,s|a,b)$ depends on a parameter x over some manifold and the task is to find the value of x such that the strength of nonlocality is maximal. We assume that $P_x(r,s|a,b)$ is differentiable with respect to x. For example, this problem is relevant in Bell experiments for which one searches for the optimal setup providing the highest nonlocal capacity. This optimization method is not convex and can have many local maxima that are not global. Here, we present a simple method for computing local maxima of the nonlocal capacity and the associated x. The method is iterative and generates a sequence $x_{n=1,2,\ldots}$ with associated nonlocal capacity, say $\mathcal{C}_{n=1,2,\ldots}$, which increases at each iteration. The method employs the particular structure of the dual Problem 3 and requires a single computation of the nonlocal capacity plus the computation of an optimal lower bound at each iteration, which can be done efficiently.

Each iteration is divided in two procedures. In the first procedure, the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ and $\rho(a)$ are computed by Algorithm 1 for the value x_n. Then, the next value x_{n+1} is computed by maximizing the dual objective function by keeping $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ and $\rho(a)$ constant. It is worth noting that the second procedure is

equivalent to the maximization of the violation of a Bell inequality. The general algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm 2.

1. $n = 1$ and set x_1 equal to some initial value.
2. Compute the Lagrange multipliers λ_n and the distribution $\rho_n(a)$ for the conditional probability $P_{x_n}(r, s|a, b)$. The computation is made by Algorithm 1.
3. Compute the maximizer $\bar{x}$ of
$$\sum_{r,s,a,b} P_x(r, s|a, b)\rho_n(a)\lambda_n(r, s, a, b) \tag{35}$$
with respect to x and set $x_{n+1} = \bar{x}$.
4. Stop if the maximization at the previous step does not make enough progress.
5. $n = n + 1$.
6. Repeat from step 2.

Let us show that the sequence $\mathcal{C}_n$ generated by Algorithm 2 increases monotonically. As $P_{x_{n+1}}(r, s|a, b)$ maximizes the objective function (31) with $\lambda = \lambda_n$ and $\rho(a) = \rho_n(a)$, we have that

$$\sum_{r,s,a,b} P_{x_{n+1}}(r, s|a, b)\rho_n(a)\lambda_n(r, s, a, b) \geq \sum_{r,s,a,b} P_{x_n}(r, s|a, b)\rho_n(a)\lambda_n(r, s, a, b) = \mathcal{C}_n.$$

The left-hand side of the inequality provides a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{n+1}$, since λ_n and $\rho_n(a)$ are a feasible point of the optimization Problem 4. Thus, $\mathcal{C}_{n+1} \geq \mathcal{C}_n$. Although the nonlocal capacity increases at each iteration, this does not guarantee that the convergence is toward a maximum. A convergence proof of this algorithm is made difficult by the implicit form of the nonlocal capacity as a function of x. Furthermore, this function is not guaranteed to be differentiable, even if $P(r, s|a, b)$ is differentiable. Nonetheless, numerical simulations show that the sequence always converges toward a local maximum. As said, the optimization is not convex, and many trials with different initial values of x have to be performed.

B. Optimal search with a given quantum state

Now, let us consider the specific problem of finding the optimal quantum-measurement setup for a given fixed quantum state. Specifically, we introduce an algorithm for solving step 3 of Algorithm 2. The procedure is essentially equivalent to maximizing the violation of a Bell inequality and can be used also for that purpose. Let $\hat{\rho}$ be the density operator of the two systems on which Alice and Bob each perform a projective measurement. Let the number of measurement outcomes R and S be the dimension of the Hilbert space associated to Alice and Bob's systems, respectively. Each measurement of Alice and Bob is characterized by a set of R and S orthogonal vectors, respectively, each vector being associated with an outcome. Let us denote the i-th vector of the m-th measurement performed by Alice and Bob by $|\alpha_{m,i}\rangle$ and $|\beta_{m,i}\rangle$, respectively. The conditional probability $P(r, s|a, b)$ takes the form

$$P(r, s|a, b) = \langle\alpha_{a,r}|\langle\beta_{b,s}|\hat{\rho}|\beta_{b,s}\rangle|\alpha_{a,r}\rangle. \tag{36}$$

The objective function of the dual problem takes the form

$$I_{dual} = \sum_{r,s,a,b} \langle\alpha_{a,r}|\langle\beta_{b,s}|\hat{\rho}|\beta_{b,s}\rangle|\alpha_{a,r}\rangle\rho(a)\lambda(r, s, a, b). \tag{37}$$

At step 3 of Algorithm 2, we have to maximize this function with respect to the vectors $|\alpha_{a,i}\rangle$ and $|\beta_{b,i}\rangle$ by keeping $\lambda(r, s, a, b)$ and $\rho(a)$ constant. The maximization is performed by keeping the orthogonality relations among the vectors associated with the same measurement. The method used in the optimization is not critical, as the hard part of Algorithm 2 is the computation of the nonlocal capacity. To find the maximum, we can use a block-maximization by alternately maximizing with respect to the vectors $|\alpha_{a,i}\rangle$ by keeping $|\beta_{b,i}\rangle$ constant and *vice versa*. Let us first consider the case of two outcomes for each measurement, that is, the case with $R = S = 2$.

1. Two-dimensional case

The outcomes r and s take two possible values, say ± 1. We consider only the maximization with respect to Alice's vectors $|\alpha_{a,r=\pm1}\rangle$, as the procedure on the other block is identical. The objective function is quadratic in the vectors $|\alpha_{a,i}\rangle$ and takes the form

$$I_{dual} = \sum_{r,a} \langle\alpha_{a,r}|\hat{\rho}_A(r, a)|\alpha_{a,r}\rangle\rho(a) \tag{38}$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}_A(r, a) \equiv \sum_{s,b} \langle\beta_{b,s}|\hat{\rho}|\beta_{b,s}\rangle\lambda(r, s, a, b). \tag{39}$$

The maximization of I_{dual} is performed with the orthogonality constraints

$$\langle\alpha_{a,r}|\alpha_{a,r'}\rangle = \delta_{r,r'}. \tag{40}$$

As the optimizations over vectors associated with different measurements are decoupled, we can perform them separately. For the sake of simplicity, let us drop the index a and write the objective function as

$$\sum_r \langle\alpha_r|\hat{\rho}_A(r)|\alpha_r\rangle \equiv J \tag{41}$$

The core problem is to solve an optimization problem of the form

Problem 5.

$$\begin{gathered}\max_{|\alpha_r\rangle} J \\ \text{subject to the constraints} \\ \langle\alpha_r|\alpha_{r'}\rangle = \delta_{r,r'}.\end{gathered} \tag{42}$$

Let us consider the unitary matrix

$$\hat{U}(\eta) = e^{\eta|\alpha_{-1}\rangle\langle\alpha_1| - \eta^*|\alpha_1\rangle\langle\alpha_{-1}|}, \tag{43}$$

where η is a complex number, and define the pair of orthogonal vectors

$$\begin{aligned}|\alpha_1,\eta\rangle &= \hat{U}(\eta)|\alpha_1\rangle, \\ |\alpha_{-1},\eta\rangle &= \hat{U}(\eta)|\alpha_{-1}\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

The set $\{|\alpha_{\pm1}\rangle\}$ is the optimizer of J only if

$$\frac{d}{d\eta}\sum_r \langle\alpha_r,\eta|\hat{\rho}_A(r)|\alpha_r,\eta\rangle\bigg|_{\eta=0} = 0, \tag{45}$$

the symbol η being dealt as a independent variable with respect to the complex conjugate η^*. Eq. (45) implies that

$$\langle\alpha_1|\left[\hat{\rho}_A(1) - \hat{\rho}_A(-1)\right]|\alpha_{-1}\rangle = 0. \tag{46}$$

Thus, the pair of orthogonal vectors maximizing J are such that $\hat{\rho}_A(1) - \hat{\rho}_A(-1)$ is diagonal in that basis, that is, the pair is given by the eigenvectors of $\hat{\rho}_A(1) - \hat{\rho}_A(-1)$. There are only two solutions. Depending on the order of the vectors in the pair, we have the maximum or the minimum.

2. *Higher dimensions*

In the higher-dimensional case, the most general unitary matrix takes the form

$$\hat{U}(\hat{\eta}) = e^{\sum_{i,j}\eta_{ij}|\alpha_i\rangle\langle\alpha_j|}. \tag{47}$$

where $\hat{\eta}$ is a $R\times R$ anti-Hermitian matrix with elements η_{ij}. Let us define the vectors $|\alpha_r,\hat{\eta}\rangle \equiv \hat{U}(\hat{\eta})|\alpha_r\rangle$. The set $\{|\alpha_r\rangle\}$ is a stationary point of J if and only if

$$\frac{d}{d\eta_{ij}}\sum_r \langle\alpha_r,\hat{\eta}|\hat{\rho}_A(r)|\alpha_r,\hat{\eta}\rangle\bigg|_{\hat{\eta}=0} = 0, \tag{48}$$

the symbol η_{ij} being dealt as a independent variable with respect to the complex conjugate $\eta_{ij}^* = -\eta_{ji}$. Condition (48) implies the optimality condition

$$\langle\alpha_i|\left[\hat{\rho}_A(i) - \hat{\rho}_A(j)\right]|\alpha_j\rangle = 0. \tag{49}$$

These equations are equivalent to the optimality condition (46) of the two-dimensional case, applied to every pair of vectors $|\alpha_r\rangle$. To solve Eqs. (49), we can maximize cyclically over every pair. This procedure monotonically increases the functional J. We expect that the generated sequence asymptotically converges toward a stationary point, as each maximization will make progress until the conditions (49) are satisfied for every i and j. Indeed, it can be shown that the convergence is implied by Zoutendijk's theorem [38]. Numerical tests show that the procedure quickly converges toward the maximum of J, the computation taking a time that is negligible with respect to the computation of the nonlocal capacity at step 2 of Algorithm 2. Possibly, J could have local maxima that are not global. Thus, one could need to repeat the procedure with different initial conditions and check if the iteration converges to different local maxima.

Algorithms 1 and 2 are the main results of this paper. In the next section, we will discuss the relationship between Bell violation and nonlocal capacity, which is computed by Algorithm 1 and optimized by Algorithm 2 over a given configuration space.

VI. NONLOCAL CAPACITY AND BELL VIOLATION

In Ref. [28], Pironio proved that the minimal average amount of communication required by a classical simulation of nonlocal correlations turns out to be equal to the maximal violation of the Bell inequalities, once the inequalities are suitably normalized. Here, we prove a similar result and show that there is a functional relationship between Bell violation and nonlocal capacity. Namely, given a Bell inequality, we prove that the nonlocal capacity is bounded from below by a function of the violation. Furthermore, there is an optimal Bell inequality such that the bound turns out to be equal to the nonlocal capacity. The optimal inequality is not necessarily a facet of the local polytope. Let us first introduce the local polytope and the definition of Bell inequalities.

A. Local polytope

The correlations between the outcomes r and s associated with the measurements a and b are local if and only if the conditional probability $P(r,s|a,b)$ takes the form

$$P(r,s|a,b) = \sum_x P_A(r|a,x)P_B(s|b,x)P_S(x), \tag{50}$$

where P_A, P_B, and P_S are suitable probability distributions. In this case, the correlations can be simulated through shared randomness and no communication is required. In particular, the nonlocal capacity is equal to zero if and only if the correlations are local. It is always possible to write the conditional probabilities P_A and P_B as convex combination of deterministic processes, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}P_A(r|a,x) &= \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{r}} P_A^{det}(r|\mathbf{r},a)\rho_A(\mathbf{r}|x), \\ P_B(s|b,x) &= \textstyle\sum_{\mathbf{s}} P_B^{det}(s|\mathbf{s},b)\rho_B(\mathbf{s}|x),\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where $\mathbf{r} \equiv (r_1, \ldots, r_A)$, $\mathbf{s} \equiv (s_1, \ldots, s_B)$, $P_A^{det}(r|\mathbf{r}, a) = \delta_{r_a,r}$ and $P_B^{det}(s|\mathbf{s}, b) = \delta_{s_b,s}$. Using this decomposition, Eq. (50) takes the form of a convex combination of deterministic distributions. That is,

$$P(r, s|a, b) = \sum_{\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s}} P_A^{det}(r|\mathbf{r}, a) P_B^{det}(s|\mathbf{s}, b) \rho_{AB}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}), \quad (52)$$

where $\rho_{AB}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = \sum_x \rho_A(\mathbf{r}|x)\rho_B(\mathbf{s}|x)P_S(x)$. Thus, the set of local distributions is a polytope, called *local polytope*, defined by $R^A S^B$ vertices. Each vertex is specified by the sequences $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{s}$ and is given by the deterministic distribution $P_A^{det}(r|\mathbf{r}, a)P_B^{det}(s|\mathbf{s}, b)$. Since the elements of the local polytope are normalized distributions and satisfy the nonsignaling conditions (1), the $RSAB$ parameters defining $P(r, s|a, b)$ are not independent and the polytope lives in a lower-dimensional subspace. The dimension of this subspace and, more generally, of the subspace of NS-boxes is equal to [20]

$$d_{NS} \equiv AB(R-1)(S-1) + A(R-1) + B(S-1). \quad (53)$$

By the Minkowski-Weyl theorem, the local polytope can be represented as the intersection of finitely many half-spaces. A half-space is defined by an inequality

$$\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r, s|a, b)B(r, s; a, b) \leq L. \quad (54)$$

In the case of the local polytope, these inequalities are called *Bell inequalities*. A minimal representation of a polytope is given by the set of facets of the polytope. A half-space $\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r, s|a, b)B(r, s; a, b) \leq L$ specifies a facet if the associated hyperplane $\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r, s|a, b)B(r, s; a, b) = L$ intersects the boundary of the polytope in a set with dimension equal to the dimension of the polytope minus one. A distribution $P(r, s|a, b)$ is local if and only if every facet inequality is not violated. To check the violation of every inequality is not generally a tractable problem, but to test the membership to the local polytope can be done in polynomial time [18].

Generally, the parameter L in Ineq. (54) is chosen so that the boundary $\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r, s|a, b)B(r, s; a, b) = L$ of the half-space touches the local polytope, that is, so that the boundary contains at least one vertex (see for example Ref. [28]). This is attained by taking

$$L = \max_{\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s}} \sum_{a,b} B(r_a, s_b; a, b). \quad (55)$$

If a distribution $P(r, s|a, b)$ is nonlocal, it violates some Bell inequality and the strength of the violation is given by the positive quantity

$$\Delta B \equiv \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r, s|a, b)B(r, s; a, b) - L. \quad (56)$$

The maximum of ΔB over the whole set of Bell inequalities can be used as a measure of the violation. However, this measure suffers from an ambiguity. Indeed, the coefficients in Eq. (54) are uniquely defined by the half-space up to a multiplicative constant. Although, the multiplicative constant does not affect the order in the violation strength for each inequality, this is not the case for the maximal violation over the whole set of inequalities, since it is possible to choose different constants for each inequality. A general rule is to set the multiplicative constant so that L is equal to 2, which is the value used in the CHSH inequality introduced in Ref. [39]. However, there is another ambiguity since the local polytope has a dimension d_{NS} lower than the number of parameters $B(r, s; a, b)$. The ambiguity stemming from the nonsignaling conditions does not affect the strength of the violation. However, this is not the case for the ambiguity associated with the normalization of $P(r, s|a, b)$. Indeed, the transformations $B(r, s; a, b) \to B(r, s; a, b) + K(a, b)$ and $L \to L + \sum_{a,b} K(a, b)$ do not change the half-space in the subspace of normalized distributions, but it changes the strength of the violation once the transformed L is normalized to 2. Another general rule is to fix partially the additional terms $K(a, b)$ by setting the quantity at the left-hand side of Ineq. (54) equal to 0 in the case of uniform distributions. Although this does not determine uniquely $K(a, b)$, it fixes the ambiguity on the violation strength. Besides this ambiguity, the Bell violation does not have a clear information-theoretic meaning. In the next subsection, we introduce a functional relation between Bell violation and nonlocal capacity. This relation fixes the aforementioned ambiguity by providing an information-theoretic meaning to the Bell violation.

B. Lower bounds on the nonlocal capacity

In Sec. IV, we introduced Problem 4, which is the dual form of Problem 1. Its solution gives the nonlocal capacity of the NS-box $P(r, s|a, b)$. As already stressed previously, an appealing property of the dual problem is that the constraints do not depend on $P(r, s|a, b)$. Thus, the objective function gives a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity for every $P(r, s|a, b)$, provided that $\rho(a)$ and $\lambda(r, s, a, b)$ satisfy the constraints. Furthermore, the objective function has the linear form of the left-hand side of a Bell inequality (54).

If $\rho(a)$ and $\lambda(r, s, a, b)$ do not satisfy the constraints, a feasible point can be easily generated with the transformation

$$\lambda(r, s, a, b) \to \lambda(r, s, a, b) + B^{-1}K_\lambda, \quad (57)$$

where K_λ is a suitable constant. Namely, it is sufficient to set

$$K_\lambda = -\log \max_{\mathbf{s}} \sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r, s_b, a, b)}. \quad (58)$$

Thus, for every $\rho(a)$ and $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \geq \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b) + K_\lambda. \quad (59)$$

The right-hand side of this inequality provides a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity and can be used in Algorithm 1 for computing the accuracy at each iteration. The computed lower bound converges to the nonlocal capacity as $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ and $\rho(a)$ converge to the solution of Problem 4.

Every function $\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ can be associated with a Bell half-space by identifying $\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ with the Bell coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$ up to a multiplicative factor. That is,

$$\gamma\rho(a)\lambda(r,s;a,b) \leftrightarrow B(r,s;a,b), \quad (60)$$

where γ is some constant. It is convenient to define the non-normalized function $\eta(a) = \gamma\rho(a)$, which completely determines γ and $\rho(a)$. Namely, we have $\gamma = \sum_a \eta(a)$ and $\rho(a) = \gamma^{-1}\eta(a)$. In terms of the Bell coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$ and the violation ΔB, Ineq. (59) takes the form

$$\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \geq \frac{\Delta B + L}{\gamma} + K_\eta. \quad (61)$$

where

$$K_\eta \equiv -\log \max_{\mathbf{s}} \sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\eta^{-1}(a)\sum_b B(r,s_b;a,b)}. \quad (62)$$

This inequality holds for every non-negative function $\eta(a)$. For local correlations, the right-hand side of the inequality is non-positive, since the nonlocal capacity is equal to zero. This can be directly checked by using the Jensen inequality in the last term. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-K_\eta} &= \max_{\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s}} \textstyle\sum_a \rho(a) e^{\eta^{-1}(a)\sum_b B(r_a,s_b;a,b)} \\ &\geq e^{\gamma^{-1}\max_{\mathbf{r},\mathbf{s}}\sum_{a,b} B(r_a,s_b;a,b)} \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

which implies, by definition of L, that

$$K_\eta \leq -\gamma^{-1}L. \quad (64)$$

Note that the bound on the nonlocal capacity can be negative even if the associated Bell inequality is violated, since the left-hand side of Ineq. (64) is generally different from $-\gamma^{-1}L$. However, the difference can be made arbitrarily small by taking $\eta(a)$ sufficiently large. Indeed, in the limit of large $\eta(a)$, the exponential in K_η can be well approximated by its linear expansion.

We can get rid of $\eta(a)$ by maximizing the right-hand of Ineq. (61) over the space of non-negative $\eta(a)$. We have

$$\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \geq F(\Delta B), \quad (65)$$

where

$$F(\Delta B) \equiv \max_{\eta(a)\geq 0} \left[\frac{\Delta B + L}{\gamma} + K_\eta\right]. \quad (66)$$

The function $F(\Delta B)$ has now the nice feature of being positive if and only if the violation ΔB is positive. Note that $F(\Delta B)$ depends on the Bell coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$. Every Bell inequality has an associated function $F(\Delta B)$, which provides a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity. Furthermore, there is an optimal inequality such that $F(\Delta B)$ is a tight bound and turns out to be equal to the nonlocal capacity, as stated by the following.

Theorem 3. *Given an NS-box $P(r,s|a,b)$ there is an optimal set of Bell coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} = F(\Delta B)$. The Bell coefficients are $B(r,s;a,b) = \rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b)$, where $\rho(a)$ and $\lambda(r,s;a,b)$ are solutions of Problem 4.*

Proof. Let $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ and $\rho(a)$ be the solution of Problem 4. Thus,

$$\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} = \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b). \quad (67)$$

Furthermore,

$$\sum_a \rho(a) \max_r e^{\sum_b \lambda(r,s_b,a,b)} \leq 1. \quad (68)$$

Proof. Let us take $B(r,s;a,b) = \rho(a)\lambda(r,s;a,b)$ and $\eta(a) = \rho(a)$. Then, Ineq. (68) implies that $K_\eta \geq 0$. This inequality, the definition of ΔB and the definition of $F(\Delta B)$ imply that $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \leq F(\Delta B)$. As also the inequality $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \geq F(\Delta B)$ holds, the theorem is proven. □

Corollary 1. The set of quantum measurements maximizing the the nonlocal capacity maximizes also the violation of the optimal Bell inequality defined by the coefficients $B(r,s;a,b) = \rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b)$, where $\rho(a)$ and $\lambda(r,s;a,b)$ are solutions of Problem 4.

This corollary is quite obvious. Indeed, if the violation of the optimal inequality was not maximal, then step 3 of Algorithm 2 would find another experimental setup such that the nonlocal capacity is greater, in contradiction with the hypothesis. The corollary implies that the set of measurements maximizing the nonlocal capacity also maximizes the violation of a facet-defining Bell inequality if $\rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ are the coefficients of such a Bell inequality.

As mentioned previously, the definition of the Bell coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$ suffers from an ambiguity stemming from the nonsignaling conditions satisfied by $P(r,s|a,b)$. Namely, given a real function $A(r,s;a,b)$ such that $\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)A(r,s;a,b) = 0$ for every nonsignaling $P(r,s|a,b)$, the transformation $B(r,s;a,b) \to B(r,s;a,b) + A(r,s;a,b)$ does not change the Bell half-space in the subspace of nonsignaling distributions. This ambiguity does not affect the value of the Bell violation, but it can affect the value of the second term at the right-hand side of Eq. (66). The same feature is also present

in the bounds derived by Pironio [28]. The dependence of $F(\Delta B)$ on the extra-term $A(r,s;a,b)$ means that each Bell inequality is associated with an infinity of bounds. We can get rid of this dependence by performing a further maximization over $A(r,s;a,b)$, so that we have the bound

$$\bar{F}(\Delta B) \equiv \max_{\eta(a)\geq 0, A\in\mathcal{A}} \left[\frac{\Delta B + L}{\gamma} + \bar{K}_\eta\right], \qquad (69)$$

where $\bar{K}_\eta$ is obtained from K_η by replacing the coefficients B with $B+A$, and $\mathcal{A}$ is the set of functions $A(r,s;a,b)$ such that $\sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)A(r,s;a,b) = 0$ for every nonsignaling $P(r,s|a,b)$.

VII. NUMERICAL TESTS

In this last section, we illustrate the introduced optimization method through some numerical tests on entangled qubits as well as entangled qutrits. The method is compared with the maximization of the violation of facet-defining Bell inequalities. The considered quantum states take the form

$$|\psi(\gamma_1,\gamma_2)\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B + \gamma_1|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B + \gamma_2|2\rangle_A|2\rangle_B}{\sqrt{1+\gamma_1^2+\gamma_2^2}}, \quad (70)$$

with $\gamma_1 \in [0,1]$ and $\gamma_2 \in \{0,1\}$. Entangled qubits and qutrits corresponds to $\gamma_2 = 0$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$, respectively.

We first consider the case of entangled qubits ($\gamma_2 = 0$) with two measurements and two outcomes, and compute numerically the set of measurements maximizing the nonlocal capacity as well as the violation of the CHSH inequality. The resulting two optimal sets turn out to be very similar for every γ_1 and identical for the maximally entangled state ($\gamma_1 = 1$). Namely, the set maximizing the violation of a facet-defining Bell inequality is approximately optimal also for the nonlocal capacity. We also find that the Bell inequality such that $\bar{F}(\Delta B)$ is the nonlocal capacity is a facet of the local polytope for $\gamma_1 = 1$. The study is then extended to the case of qutrits, for which we maximize numerically the violation of the Collins-Gisin-Linden-Massar-Popescu inequality [40, 41] (CGLMP3). The resulting optimal measurement setting turns out to be notably different from the setting maximizing the nonlocal capacity in a range of γ_1 between about 0.5 and 0.8. This implies that the Bell inequality with maximal $\bar{F}(\Delta B)$ is far away from being a CGLMP facet. In fact, it turns out that the inequality is not close to any facet of the local polytope. We also find that the anomaly of nonlocality is even stronger if the nonlocal capacity is employed instead of the CGLMP violation.

Thereby, we follow the notation of Ref. [20], referring to the Bell inequalities for a given Bell scenario as Bell-$ABRS$ inequality, where A and B represent the number of measurements and R and S the number of outputs for Alice and Bob, respectively. The left-hand side of the Bell inequality (54) is denoted by the symbol $\mathcal{B}_{ABRS}$, namely,

$$\mathcal{B}_{ABRS} \equiv \sum_{r,s,a,b} P(r,s|a,b)B(r,s;a,b). \qquad (71)$$

The conditional probability $P(r,s|a,b)$ and the coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$ will be occasionally represented also as $RSAB$-dimensional vectors $\vec{P}$ and $\vec{B}$, respectively.



FIG. 1: Minimal average communication cost $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ (solid line) and nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ as functions of γ_1 for entangled qubits ($\gamma_2 = 0$).

A. Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt Inequality

In the simplest bipartite Bell scenario with two settings and two outcomes per party, the local polytope has dimension 8 with 24 facets, i.e. 16 positivity facets and 8 CHSH facets. Let the outcomes r and s take the values ± 1. Thus, a CHSH inequality takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\sum_{r,s} rs\,[P(r,s|0,0) - P(r,s|0,1) + \\ P(r,s|1,0) + P(r,s|1,1)] \leq 2.\end{aligned} \qquad (72)$$

The other CHSH inequalities are obtained by permuting the outcome values and exchanging the measurement settings.

According to Ref. [28], the violation of any suitably normalized Bell inequality sets a lower bound on the single-shot communication complexity of a NS-box. Furthermore, there is an optimal Bell inequality such that the violation turns out to be equal to the communication complexity. In the Bell-2222 scenario, the optimal inequality is a facet of the local polytope [28]. Namely, we have

$$\mathcal{C}_{min} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}_{2222} - 1, \qquad (73)$$

provided that the facet with maximal violation is taken. We have computed the set of measurements maximizing the nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ as well as the communication complexity $\mathcal{C}_{min}$, that is, the violation. In Fig. 1, we report the corresponding values of $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ as functions of γ_1. The two measures display similar behavior, although the nonlocal capacity turns out to be quite smaller than the communication complexity. The two quantities satisfy the inequalities $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \leq \mathcal{C}_{min} \leq \mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} + 2\log(\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}+1) + 2\log_2 e$, which come from Theorems 1,2.

Algorithm 1, used for computing the nonlocal capacity, generates also the functions $\rho(a)$ and $\lambda(r,s,a,b)$ that are solutions of Problem 4. Thus, the bound $\bar{F}(\Delta B)$ that is maximal and equal to the nonlocal capacity is associated with the Bell coefficients $B(r,s;a,b) = \rho(a)\lambda(r,s,a,b)$, as stated by Theorem 3. The coefficients maximizing the bound are unique up to the transformation $B(r,s;a,b) \to B(r,s;a,b) + A(r,s;a,b)$, where $A(r,s;a,b)$ is any function in $\mathcal{A}$ (defined at the end of Sec. VI B). This transformation changes the components of the vector $\vec{B}$ which are orthogonal to the local polytope. Whereas the vector $\vec{B}$ defining a CHSH inequality is parallel to the local polytope, this is not the case for the vector computed from the solution of Problem 4. To compare the computed $B(r,s;a,b)$ with the facet-defining coefficients, we have removed the orthogonal components by computing the projection $\vec{B}_{\|}$ of $\vec{B}$ onto the subspace of the NS-boxes. Then, we have evaluated the scalar product between the normalized vector $\vec{B}_{\|}$ and the normalized CHSH vector. Let us denote this quantity by

$$S_B \equiv \frac{\vec{B}_{\|} \cdot \vec{B}_f}{\|\vec{B}_{\|}\|\|\vec{B}_f\|}, \tag{74}$$

where $\vec{B}_f$ is the vector orthogonal to a CHSH facet. For the maximally entangled state ($\gamma_1 = 1$), S_B is equal to 1 and, thus, the coefficients $B(r,s;a,b)$ turn out to define a facet of the local polytope. This also implies that the measurement setup maximizing the violation is also optimal for the nonlocal capacity. The quantity S_B decreases by decreasing γ_1 and reaches the minimum 0.86 at about $\gamma_1 = 0.48$. Thus, the maximal angle between $\vec{B}_{\|}$ and $\vec{B}_f$ is about 30 degrees. At first glance, this angle seems to be quite large. However, one has to keep in mind that the nonsignaling space has dimension 8 and two randomly generated vectors tend to be almost orthogonal in high-dimensional spaces for the principle of the concentration of measure. In particular, the probability that two randomly generated 8-dimensional vectors have an angle smaller than 30 degrees is about 0.3%.

We have then compared the optimal set for the nonlocal capacity with the set obtained by maximizing the violation of CHSH inequalities. Namely, we have evaluated the nonlocal capacity by taking the measurement setup maximizing the Bell violation. For every γ_1 the resulting value differs from the maximal nonlocal capacity by a small value not greater than about 10^{-3}. Thus, the tilt between $\vec{B}_{\|}$ and $\vec{B}_f$ has a small effect on the optimal configuration, which can be computed with good approximation by merely maximizing the violation of the CHSH inequality.

B. Collins-Gisin-Linden-Massar-Popescu Inequality

Let us now consider the case of entangled qutrits with two measurements and three outcomes per party. In this Bell-2233 scenario, the local polytope lies in a hyperplane of dimension 24 and consists of 1116 facets. Thereby, besides 36 positivity facets, we encounter 432 CGLMP3 facets as well as 648 facets which can be identified as liftings of the CHSH inequality [42]. To compute the facets, we used the software package FAACETS [43, 44]. Denoting by $P(r_a = s_b + k)$ the probability that the outcomes r_a and s_b of measurements a and b differ by k modulo 3, a CGLMP3 inequality takes the form [40]

$$\begin{aligned} &P(r_0 = s_0) + P(s_0 = r_1 + 1) + P(r_1 = s_1) \\ &+P(s_1 = r_0) - P(r_0 = s_0 - 1) - P(s_0 = r_1) \\ &-P(r_1 = s_1 - 1) - P(s_1 = r_0 - 1) \leq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

The violation of this inequality, divided by 2, gives a lower bound on the single-shot communication complexity of a NS-box [28]. This lower bound turns out to be equal to the communication complexity, provided that the measurement setting maximizes the violation [28], which is the case considered here. Thus,

$$\mathcal{C}_{min} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}_{2233} - 1. \tag{76}$$



FIG. 2: Bell violation $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ (solid line) and nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ (dashed line) as functions of γ_1 for entangled qutrits ($\gamma_2 = 1$).



FIG. 3: Nonlocal capacity of entangled qutrits as a function of γ_1, maximized over the set of measurements (dashed line), and computed by using the measurement setting with maximal violation of the CGLMP3 inequality (solid line).

As done in the case of entangled qubits, we have computed the set of measurements maximizing the nonlocal capacity $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ as well as the normalized CGLMP violation, that is, $\mathcal{C}_{min}$. In Fig. 2, we report the corresponding values of $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{min}$ as functions of γ_1. Also in this case, the two quantities satisfy the inequalities $\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} \leq \mathcal{C}_{min} \leq \mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} + 2\log(\mathcal{C}_{min}^{asym} + 1) + 2\log_2 e$, although they are evaluated with optimal measurement settings that are actually notably different, as we will see.

In Ref. [45], it was shown that the largest violation of the CGLMP inequality is exhibited for a non-maximally entangled state, namely, for $\gamma_1 \simeq 0.79$. This behavior, known as anomaly of nonlocality [46], shows that there is not a monotonic relationship between strength of entanglement and strength of nonlocal correlations, if the latter is defined as Bell violation and two measurements per party are considered. Remarkably, besides the fact that both curves in Fig. 2 are non-monotonic, the maximal value for the nonlocal capacity is taken at $\gamma_1 \simeq 0.62$, which is significantly lower than the value at which the Bell violation is maximal. Namely, if the nonlocal capacity is employed as a measure of nonlocality instead of the CGLMP violation, the maximal strength of nonlocality is exhibited for a quantum state with even less entanglement.

This higher anomaly is displayed by taking a set of measurements that is optimal for the nonlocal capacity, but it becomes even stronger if the set of measurements maximizing the Bell violation is taken. In Fig. 3, we report the nonlocal capacity evaluated with this set (solid line) as well as the maximal nonlocal capacity (dashed line). The former displays two local maxima. One maximum is at $\gamma_1 \simeq 0.79$, where also the Bell violation is maximal. The other one is the absolute maximum and is at $\gamma_1 \simeq 0.5$. It is worth to note that the optimal setup maximizing the CGLMP violation is independent of γ_1 for values of the parameter between about 0.63 and 1. The analytic expression of this set of measurements is given in Ref. [40]. Below 0.63, the maximizer becomes a function of γ_1. Curiously, this threshold is the value at which the cusp in Fig. 3 is located.

The notable difference between the two curves in Fig. 3 implies that the measurement setup maximizing the CGLMP violation is far away from being a good approximation of the optimal setup for the nonlocal capacity. Thus, the two optimization methods produce notably different optimal sets of measurements.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a simple algorithm for computing the nonlocal capacity of nonlocal correlations, which provides a measure of nonlocality as an alternative to the extent of violations of Bell inequalities. The algorithm is an adaptation of a method introduced in Ref. [29] for quantum channels to the case of nonlocal correlations. Then, we have introduced an algorithm for maximizing the nonlocal capacity with respect to the experimental setup. In particular, we have considered the maximization with respect to the measurement setting. The method has been applied to the case of qubits and qutrits. In the case of qubits, the maximization of the nonlocal capacity does not produce a measurement setting that is notably different from the optimal configuration maximizing the CHSH violation. Conversely, in the case of non-maximally entangled qutrits, the two maximization methods turn out to produce notably different optimal setups. Remarkably, the anomaly of nonlocality showed in Ref. [45] becomes even stronger once the nonlocal capacity is employed as a measure of nonlocality. If the set of measurements maximizing the CGLMP violation is used, the nonlocal capacity displays two local maxima, the absolute maximum being taken for a quantum state that is notably less entangled than the quantum state maximizing the CGLMP violation [45].

We have also showed that, for every Bell inequality, there is a function of the violation providing a lower bound on the nonlocal capacity. Furthermore, there is an optimal Bell inequality such that the function turns out to be equal to the nonlocal capacity. The optimal inequality does not necessarily define a facet of the local polytope. This relationship between nonlocal capacity and Bell violation is an adaptation of the results of Ref. [28] to the case of the asymptotic communication complexity. The lower bounds on the nonlocal capacity and on the single-shot communication complexity derived in Ref. [28] are essentially equivalent in the limit of large communication complexity. This equivalence, which is not evident by scrutinizing the mathematical expressions of the bounds, can be a fruitful object of future investigation.

Unlike the measure of entanglement, which is essentially unique for pure states and equal to the entropy of entanglement [47, 48], there are different possible measures of nonlocality, such as the one considered in Ref. [49], which is defined as the relative entropy $D(P||P_L)$ between a given joint distribution $P(r,s|a,b)$ and the closest local distribution $P_L(r,s|a,b)$ minimizing D. Interestingly, besides the maximization of the nonlocal capacity, the introduced method can be applied for maximizing this other measure. For this purpose, it is sufficient to derive the dual form of the original minimization problem. The resulting dual objective function is identical to the dual objective function derived here, and the dual constraints display the same properties that we have used to derive the algorithm optimizing the experimental setup.

Finally, the optimization problem can be used for solving an open question concerning Werner states. A Werner state is a mixture between a maximally entangled state and the identity density operator. In the case of entangled qubits, the Werner state admits a local model if the probability weight of the maximally entangled state, say γ, is smaller than 0.659 [50] and is nonlocal for $1/\sqrt{2} \leq \gamma \leq 1$, as the CHSH inequalities are violated. In Ref. [51], Vértesi derived a family of Bell inequalities that are violated for $\gamma > 0.7056$, which is slightly below the bound $1/\sqrt{2}$. This family requires 465 measurement settings on each side. Thus, the value, say γ_0, at which the transition local-nonlocal occurs is between 0.659 and 0.7056. Is it possible to derive a better upper bound on γ_0 with a much smaller set of measurements? To answer this question, in Ref. [26], the nonlocal capacity was computed for a number of measurements up to 20 by trying a high number of different settings, such as highly symmetric settings and random configurations. However, we always found a transition at $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{2}$. The optimization algorithm introduced in this paper can help to find a better set of measurements for which the transition occurs at a lower value of γ. Note that the algorithm provides also the Bell inequality that is violated.

Acknowledgments. This work is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant PP00P2_133596), the NCCR QSIT, the COST action on Fundamental Problems in Quantum Physics, and Hasler foundation through the project "Information-Theoretic Analysis of Experimental Qudit Correlations".

[1] J. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[2] J.-D. Bancal et al., Nature Physics **8**, 867 (2012).
[3] T. J. Barnea et al., Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022123 (2013).
[4] C. J. Wood, R. W. Spekkens, New J. Phys. **17**, 033002 (2015)
[5] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010503 (2005).
[6] A. Acín, N. Gisin, and L. Masanes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 120405 (2006)
[7] V. Scarani et al., Phys. Rev. A **74**, 042339 (2006).
[8] A. Acín, S. Massar, and S. Pironio, New J. Phys. **8**, 126 (2006).
[9] A. Acín at al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 230501 (2007).
[10] Ll. Masanes, R. Renner, M. Christandl, A. Winter, J. Barrett, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory, **60**, 4973 (2014).
[11] E. Hänggi, R. Renner, S. Wolf, Theor. Comp. Sci. **486**, 27 (2013).
[12] R. Colbeck and R. Renner, Nature Physics **8**, 450 (2012).
[13] R. Gallego, Ll. Masanes, G. de la Torre, C. Dhara, L. Aolita, A. Acín, Nature Communications **4**, 2654 (2013).
[14] R. Cleve and H. Buhrman, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1201 (1997).
[15] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, and R. de Wolf, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 665 (2010).
[16] G. Brassard, R. Cleve, and A. Tapp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1874 (1999).
[17] W. van Dam. *Nonlocality and Communication Complexity. PhD thesis*, University of Oxford, Department of Physics (2000); W. van Dam, arXiv:quant-ph/0501159.
[18] I. Pitowski, *Quantum Probability – Quantum Logic*, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989).
[19] D. Avis, K. Fukuda, Discrete Comput. Geom. **8**, 295 (1992).
[20] D. Collins, N. Gisin, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **37**, 1775 (2004).
[21] C. Budroni, A. Cabello, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 385304 (2012).
[22] T. Maudlin, *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association* (D. Hull, M. Forbes, and K. Okruhlik. Philosophy of Science Association, East Lansing, MI, 1992), vol. 1, pp. 404-417.
[23] M. Steiner, Phys. Lett. A **270**, 239 (2000).
[24] N. Gisin and B. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **260**, 323 (1999).
[25] C. Branciard, N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 020401 (2011).
[26] A. Montina, S. Wolf, New J. Phys. **18**, 013035 (2016).
[27] C. Bernhard, B. Bessire, A. Montina, M. Pfaffhauser, A. Stefanov, S. Wolf, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 424013 (2014).
[28] S. Pironio, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062102 (2003).
[29] A. Hansen, A. Montina, S. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 042315 (2016).
[30] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1991).
[31] S. Boyd, L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
[32] M. Sion, Pac. J. Math. **8**(1) 171 (1958); H. Komiya, Kodai Math. J. **11** (1), 5 (1988).
[33] S. Boyd, S.-J. Kim, L. Vandenberghe, A. Hassibi, Optim. Eng. **8**, 67 (2007).
[34] Mung Chiang, Found. Trends Commun. Inf. Theory **2**, 1 (2005).
[35] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear Programming* (Athena Scientific, Belmont MA, 1999).
[36] A. Montina, S. Wolf, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 012309 (2014).
[37] A. Montina, S. Wolf, IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT), 1484 (2014).
[38] J. Nocedal, S. J. Wright, *Numerical Optimization* (Springer, New York, 2006).

[39] J.F. Clauser, M.A. Horne, A. Shimony, R.A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 880 (1969).
[40] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, Phys. Lett. **88**, 040404 (2002).
[41] S. Schwarz, B. Bessire, and A. Stefanov, Int. J. Quantum Inform. **12**, 1560026 (2014).
[42] S. Pironio, J. Math. Phys. **46**, 062112 (2005).
[43] D. Rosset, J.-D. Bancal, and N. Gisin, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45, 424022 (2014).
[44] http://faacets.com/
[45] A. Acin, T. Durt, N. Gisin, J. I. Latorre, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052325 (2002).
[46] A. Méthot, V. Scarani, Quantum Inf. Comput. **7**, 157 (2007).
[47] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Phys. Rev. A **56**, R3319 (1997).
[48] C. H. Bennett, H. Bernstein, S. Popescu and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).
[49] W. van Dam, R.D. Gill, P.D. Grünwald, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **51**, 2812 (2005).
[50] A. Acín, N. Gisin, B. Toner, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 062105 (2006).
[51] T. Vértesi, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 032112 (2008).